

THE VOICE SYSTEM OF PAPUAN MALAY: A Typological Study

Sara Yulita Karubaba

sur-el: sarakarubaba@yahoo.com

Universitas Papua - Manokwari

Abstract

Papuan Malay is an Austronesian language spoken in the two provinces constituting Papua. Papuan Malay has four varieties. The Serui Malay variety is the main point of the discussion. I will show that the voice system of this variety displays two main levels of linguistic aspect: (1) Semantic argument level and (2) syntactical function. Both exhibit various patterns in active, passive and causative sentences. Among these are constructions of the type “X:S;Y: DO”, i.e. the first semantic (macro) role X (Actor) is mapped onto grammatical relation of the Subject, while the second semantic (macro) role Y (undergoer) is mapped onto the grammatical relation of Direct Object. Particularly, an active sentence in this variety displays Semantic argument level (roles), and Syntactical function (S, O) in transitive sentences.

There are three ways to construct passivity: (1) promotion of the object to the subject position, i.e. the object of the active sentence is promoted to be the subject of the passive sentence; (2) passive sentences; either the default agentless use of passive; or the optional, less common construction of mentioning the agent in an oblique phrase headed by *dari* “from”, which may also occur in transitive sentences. (3), causative transitive ; i.e. the causer takes the Subject position, and if the embedded verb is intransitive, transitive, or bitransitive, the causee appears as Direct Object, Indirect Object or Oblique Object.

Keywords: *voice system, Papua Malay and typological*

BACKGROUND

Papuan Malay is spoken as a first language of people belonging to every generation in two provinces in Papua. These two provinces are Papua and Irian Jaya Barat in eastern Indonesia. Nowadays, the term Irian Jaya Barat has been changed to Papua Barat. Papuan Malay is not only spoken by Papuan people but also by non-Papuan people who have grown up in these two provinces. Regarding non-Papuans who have not grown up in these provinces or are new comers in these provinces, they come for instance from *Java*, *Sumatera*, and other places in Indonesia, Papuan Malay will eventually be spoken naturally when they have contact with Papuan people or non-Papuan people living there without learning the language (Karubaba, 2014). Furthermore, Donohue (To appear) mentioned that Papuan Malay is divided into four varieties. These varieties are *South Coast*, *Serui Malay*, *Bird's Head* and *North Papua*. The following examples below will be based on the variety of Serui Malay. The aim of this paper is presenting the voice system of this variety of Papuan Malay.

THEORETICAL CONTENT

Historically, “the category of voice goes back to the ancient Greek tradition where it appears under the name *diathesis* (diathesis) ‘disposition’” (Kulikov, 2011). Besides, diathesis is “the morphological opposition between two series of verbal inflectional suffixes” in active and middle terms. In fact, the term “diathesis”, according to Kulikov (2011), came into being as “Latin grammarians have adopted [it] to the opposition between active and passive verbal forms. Also, in the modern English and French grammatical traditions, there was a term *vox* that underlines “voice and *voix*” which are referred to active/passive forms. From explanation above, Kulikov (2011) wrote that “many languages of the world encode passive diathesis by means of special morpheme verbal morpheme which interpreted as marker of passive voice”. For example, (1) in Latin “the passive voices are expressed by means of a special series of endings passive, or deponent, inflection; cf. 3sg.pass. *-tur* ~ 3sg. Act. *-t* , (2) in

Sankrit, by means of the present suffix *-ya-* and in the middle inflection, and (3) in English, by means of the auxiliary verb *be* and past participle”.

Above all, the main point of the discussion in this paper is to highlight diathesis and valency patterns in relation with two main levels of presentation of linguistics structure. Those are the level of semantic argument, or semantic roles (Agent, Patient, Experiences, etc); and the level of grammatical relation, or syntactic functions (Subject [S], Direct Object [DO], Indirect Object [IO], oblique object [Obl]. In addition to this explanation, Kulikov (2011) wrote that *Diathesis* determines a pattern of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions (grammatical relations). An additional explanation and examples are provided by Payne (1997); “Every language has operations that adjust the relationship between semantic roles and grammatical relations in clauses. Such devices are sometimes referred to as alternative voices. For example, the passive operation in English when applied to most transitive verbs places the patient in the subject role and the agent in an oblique role. The more normal arrangement for transitive verbs is for the AGENT to bear the subject relation and the PATIENT the object relation.” The following examples are given by the author:

a. active

Orna baked these cookies AGENT = subject
 PATIENT = object

b. passive

These cookies were baked by Orna PATIENT = subject
 AGENT = object

Further explanation can be seen in Payne (1997), Comrie (1976) as cited in Kulikov (2011), Tallerman (2005) and Bakker (1995).

Using the explanation above, I will show the voice system of Papuan Malay applying two main levels of presentation of linguistic aspect; Semantic argument level and syntactical function. The semantic argument and syntactical function can be seen in active, passive and causative sentences. In order to support my data analysis, therefore, some examples from Latin and Sankrit by Kulikov (2011) will be presented together with Papuan Malay examples. Also, in the discussion below, I will use the pattern of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic function by Kulikov (2011). The following patterns are “X:S;Y: DO” which means the first semantic (macro)role X (Actor) is mapped onto grammatical relation of the Subject, while the second semantic (macro) role Y (undergoer) is mapped onto the grammatical relation of Direct Object.”

Kulikov (2011) states that “the pattern where the Actor is mapped onto Subject and the Undergoer onto the Direct Object is the most common”. The following examples from Latin and Sankrit can be seen in the transitive sentence.

Latin

(1) Miles hosten occidit
 Warrior:Nom enemy:Acc kill:PRES:3SG
 ‘The warrior kills the enemy.’

Sanskrit

(2) Raja rksam han-ti
 King :NOM bear:ACC kill:PRES-3SG.ACT
 ‘The king kills the bear’

Semantic argument level (role)	X (Actor)	Y (Undergoer)
Syntactic function level (case)	S (NOM)	DO (Acc)
	(miles;raja)	hosten; rksam)

Hence, the most common pattern where the actor is mapped onto subject and undergoer into the direct object that mention above will also happen in active sentence of Papuan Malay. The following scheme below shows the pattern of mapping semantic arguments onto syntactical function.

PAPUAN MALAY

Active Sentence

The analysis in the tables below shows how Semantic argument level (roles) and Syntactical function (S, O) occur in transitive sentence.

- (3) *Simon de pukul sa pu ade*
 Simon 3sg hit 1sg POSS young brother/sister
 ‘Simon hits my young brother/sister’

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(Simon)	(ade)

X (Actor) : *Simon* Y (undergoer) : *ade*
 S : *Simon* DO : *ade*

- (4) *Nelvan de lempar sa pu kaka*
 Nelvan 3sg throw 1sg my brother/sister
 ‘Nelvan throws my brother/sister’

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(Nelvan)	(kaka)

X (Actor) : *Nelvan* Y (undergoer) : *kaka*
 S : *Nelvan* DO : *kaka*

- (5) *Simon de tendang de pu ade*
 Simon 3sg kick 3sg POSS young brother/sister
 ‘Simon kicks his young brother/sister’

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(Simon)	(ade)

X (Actor) : *Simon* Y (undergoer) : *ade*
 S : *Simon* DO : *ade*

Note that the active sentence has a transitive verb, and the verb has subject and object.

The analysis of passive sentence will also be discussed in this part. In order to analyze the Papuan Malay data in the passive sentences below I will also include the explanation of passive sentence by Kulikov (2011); “A modification of diathesis can be described through changes in syntactic pattern.” It means that “the modification of the basic (neutral) transitive diathesis which results in the passive equivalent of a transitive clause which have two syntactic phenomena: (1) the promotion of the initial Direct Object to the subject position (the subject of the passive construction) and (2) the demotion of the initial Subject (usually, an Agent).

Another explanation of passive sentence is as follow “the demotion of the Subject may amount either to its degrading to an Oblique Object (passive Agent), or to its removal from the structure.” Thus, it applies in Sankrit example that presented by Kulikov (2011) below.

Sankrit

- (6) rkso rajna han-ya-te
 bear:NOMking:INS kill-PRES.PASS-3SG.MED
 ‘The bear is (being) killed by the king.’

X	Y
S (NOM)	DO (ACC)

X	Y
Obl (INS)	S (NOM)

Passive Sentence

The analysis in the tables below focus on ; (1) Passive: Promotion of the object to the subject position or the object of the active sentence is promoted to be the subject of the passive sentence; (2) There are two forms of passive construction; the first is the normal agentless use of the passive; the second construction features an optional, unusual mention of the agent in an oblique phrase headed by *dari* “from”, which can be seen in the scheme number (8,10 & 12) below.

Most significantly for agentless passive, Kulikov (2011) states that “probably all languages that have a canonical passive can also freely omit the passive agent’. Therefore, in the examples of Papuan Malay below, there is omitted of the passive agent, as can be seen below.

- (7) *Sa pu ade dapa pukul*
 1sg POSS young brother/sister suffer hit
 ‘My young brother/sister was hit (by Simon).

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(<i>Simon</i>)	(<i>ade</i>)

Agentless passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	-
<i>(ade)</i>	<i>(-)</i>

- (8) *Sa pu ade dapa pukul dari Simon*
 1sg POSS young brother/sister suffer hit from Simon
 ‘My young brother/sister was hit by Simon’

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
<i>(Simon)</i>	<i>(ade)</i>

Passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	Subj.
<i>(ade)</i>	<i>(Simon)</i>

- (9) *Sa pu kaka dapa lempar*
 1sg POSS brother/sister suffer throw
 My brother/sister was thrown (by Nelvan)

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
<i>(Nelvan)</i>	<i>(kaka)</i>

Agentless passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	-
<i>(kaka)</i>	<i>(-)</i>

- (10) *Sa pu kaka dapa lempar dari Nelvan*
 1sg POSS brother/sister suffer throw from Nelvan
 ‘My brother/sister was thrown by Nelvan’

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
<i>(Nelvan)</i>	<i>(kaka)</i>

Passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	Subj.
(<i>kaka</i>)	(<i>Nelvan</i>)

- (11) *De pu ade dapa tendang*
 3sg POSS young brother/sister suffer kick
 His young brother/sister was kicked (by Simon)'

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(<i>Simon</i>)	(<i>ade</i>)

Agentless passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	-
(<i>ade</i>)	(-)

- (12) *De pu ade dapa tendang dari Simon*
 3sg POSS young brother/sister suffer kick from Simon
 His young brother/sister was kicked by Simon'

Transitive

X (Actor)	Y (undergoer)
Subj.	Obj.
(<i>Simon</i>)	(<i>ade</i>)

Passive

Y (undergoer)	X (Actor)
Obj.	Subj.
(<i>ade</i>)	(<i>Simon</i>)

Causative Sentence

According to Kulikov (2011) "Causatives can be defined as verbs which refer to a *causative situation*, that is, to a causal relation between two events, one of which believed by the speaker to be caused by another". Similar to this definition, Kulikov (2011) states that a causative is a verb or verbal construction meaning 'cause to Vo', 'make Vo' (where Vo stands for the embedded base verb). Hence, the causative derivation adds the meaning 'to cause' to the base proposition and a new actor, viz, Cuaser, to the set of semantic roles." Primarily, the causer obligatorily takes the Subject position. In contrast with the causer, the cause is demoted down the hierarchy of grammatical relations : Subject>Direct Object>Indirect Object>Oblique object. In his explanation of this hierarchy based on Comrie (1976) he emphasized that "one may expect that it occupies the highest (=leftmost) free position, means if the

embedded verb is intransitive, transitive, or bitransitive, the causee appears as Direct Object, Indirect Object or Oblique Object. For further information of Causative see, Payne (1997) & Comrie (1976) as cited in Kulikov (2011). Most significantly, the following scheme by Kulikov (2011) deals with causative of transitive that will be used for my data analysis of Papuan Malay.

Causative of Transitive

X	Y
S	DO

=>

Causer	X (Causee)	Y
S	IO	DO

Causative Sentences of Papuan Malay

The analysis in the table below is based on Causative of transitive sentences as presented in number (13) and (14). In addition to the analysis in the table below, it is therefore due to highlight two main points mentioned by Kulikov (2011) and Comrie (1976) in Kulikov (2011) ; (1) the causer obligatorily takes the Subject position, (2) if the embedded verb is intransitive, transitive, or bitransitive, the causee appears as Direct Object, Indirect Object Object or Oblique Object. Consequently, in (13) and (14) the causer obligatorily takes the Subject position and if the embedded verb is transitive, the cause appears as Direct Object that presented in the following scheme below. More importantly, the following scheme uses *Causative of Transitive* by Comrie (1976) as cited in Kulikov (2011) as explained above. In addition to causative constructions, the causative words in Papuan Malay – *kasi*, *kase*, *kas-* can be used in transitive sentences. There are no distinctions between these three forms in the context of sentences below.

- (13) *Salmon de kas/kase bangun de pu ade*
 Salmon 3sg caus wake.up 3sg POSS young brother/sister
 “Salmon woke up his young sister/ brother up”

Causative transitive

Causer	Y (Causee)
Subj.	Obj.
<i>(Salmon)</i>	<i>(ade)</i>

- (14) *Salmon de kas/kase makan de pu ade*
 Salmon 3sg caus eat 3sg Poss young brother/sister
 “Salmon feed his young brother/sister”

Causative transitive

Causer	Y (Causee)
Subj.	Obj.
<i>(Salmon)</i>	<i>(ade)</i>

CONCLUSION

The main point of this paper's discussion of voice system in Papuan Malay is to see diathesis and valency patterns in relation with two main levels of presentation of linguistics structure. The level of semantic argument, or semantic roles (Agent, Patient, Experiences, etc); and the level of grammatical relation, or syntactic functions (Subject [S], Direct Object [DO], Indirect Object [IO], oblique object [Obl] are the two main levels of presentation in linguistics structure. In addition, *Diathesis* is a pattern of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions (grammatical relations). Thus, particularly an active sentence in Papuan Malay shows how Semantic argument level (roles), and Syntactical function (S, O) occur in transitive sentence. Finally, there are three patterns to construct passive sentence (1) in passive sentence; it was explained that Promotion of the object to the subject position or the object of the active sentence is promoted to be the subject of the passive sentence; (2), in passive sentence there are two forms of passive construction; the first is the normal agentless use of passive; in second construction there appears an optional unusual mention of the agent in an oblique phrase headed by *dari* "from" which are also happened in transitive sentence. (3), in causative transitive it shows two forms those are the causer obligatorily takes the Subject position, and if the embedded verb is intransitive, transitive, or bitransitive, the causee appears as Direct Object, Indirect Object or Oblique Object.

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. L. 1995. *English Syntax. Second Edition*. America: United States.
- Donohue, Mark. *To appear. Papuan Malay*. In Orin Gensler, ed., Malay/ Indonesian linguistics. London: Curzon Press.
- Karubaba, S. Y. 2014. *Relative Clauses in Papuan Malay*. Fakultas Sastra. Manokwari. Jurnal Noken.
- Kulikov, L. 2011. *Voice Typology*. Leiden University/Universitat Gottingen. The Netherlands.
- Tallerman, M. 1998. *Understanding Syntax. Understanding Languages Series*. Second addition. Hodder Arnold.
- Payne, T. E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax. A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge University.